

**To:** Montgomery, Michael[Montgomery.Michael@epa.gov]; Albright, David[Albright.David@epa.gov]; Rao, Kate[Rao.kate@epa.gov]; Zito, Kelly[ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]  
**From:** Mogharabi, Nahal  
**Sent:** Tue 3/10/2015 5:49:48 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Times available

FYI.....

**From:** Cart, Julie [mailto:Julie.Cart@latimes.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2015 10:39 AM  
**To:** Mogharabi, Nahal  
**Subject:** RE: Times available

thanks

so you know--state is presenting these changes as having been their idea. doesn't seem so, seems they are part of requirements from epa...

**From:** Mogharabi, Nahal [mailto:MOGHARABI.NAHAL@EPA.GOV]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2015 10:37 AM  
**To:** Cart, Julie  
**Subject:** RE: Times available

Hi Julie,

Will get back to you.

Thanks,

Nahal

**From:** Cart, Julie [<mailto:Julie.Cart@latimes.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2015 10:27 AM

**To:** Mogharabi, Nahal

**Subject:** RE: Times available

nahal

i'm in Sacramento at a hearing regarding the state's UIC program.

There are references to a letter sent to DOGGR yesterday.

i've quickly reviewed it.

Correct to say that EPA approved the state's plan to get the UIC program in compliance with fed law. also, set new deadlines for review.

did the EPA mandate no new injection wells in the 11 aquifers in question, or did that promise come from the state?

thanks

julie cart